

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MATTHEW JOHN SHEFFER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CENTRE COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:18-CV-02080

(Chief Judge Brann)

(Chief Magistrate Judge Mehalchick)

ORDER

MARCH 7, 2022

Matthew John Sheffer, a Pennsylvania state prisoner, filed this civil rights complaint alleging that numerous defendants violated his rights during the course of his arrest, detention, and conviction in state court.¹ In January 2022, Chief Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court grant three motions to dismiss filed by Defendants.² Sheffer filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation.³

“If a party objects timely to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court must ‘make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.’”⁴

¹ Doc. 1.

² Doc. 70.

³ Doc. 72.

⁴ *Equal Emp’t Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Long Branch*, 866 F.3d 93, 99 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)).

Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations.⁵ After conducting a *de novo* review of the Report and Recommendation, the Court finds no error in Chief Magistrate Judge Mehalchick’s recommendation that Defendants’ motions to dismiss be granted.⁶ Consequently, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Chief Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 70) is **ADOPTED**;
2. Defendants’ motions to dismiss (Docs. 57, 59, 65) are **GRANTED**, and all claims are dismissed with prejudice—with the exception of Sheffer’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim against Jeffrey Ebeck, which is dismissed without prejudice;
3. Sheffer’s motion for reconsideration (Doc. 73) is **DENIED**; and
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann
Chief United States District Judge

⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.

⁶ Although Sheffer objects in part because Chief Magistrate Judge Mehalchick notes that the motions to dismiss are unopposed, Doc. 72, that conclusion does not form the basis of her Report and Recommendation, and dismissal is warranted for the reasons set forth by Chief Magistrate Judge Mehalchick therein.